603909

603709

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE RECONSIDERED

Hans Speier

P-196

5 February 1951

Approved for OTS release

DDC

AUG 19 1964

DDC-IRA   C

I.

The term psychological warfare has gained wide currency in popular and scientific discussions, but its meaning is not clear. For three reasons the term is debated among those who use it freely.

First, warfare cannot readily be expected to be waged in times of peace or, for that matter, against the populations of neutral and allied countries in wartime, unless it is felt that by virtue of being "psychological" this kind of warfare is not "real" warfare. During the Second World War, psychological warfare was indeed regarded primarily as a responsibility of the military who fought the enemy, whereas the civilian Office of War Information never officially professed before the Congress and the public its concern with it. Soon after the end of the war the relationship between the Soviet Union and the Western powers began to be characterized as a state of cold war--incidentally no less ambiguous a term than "psychological warfare"-- but while according to many observers of the international scene the traditional distinction between war and peace cannot be applied in the postwar period, no government involved in the cold war has as yet stated that it is engaged in psychological warfare against other nations. Rather, there is talk of "international information" and, reluctantly, of propaganda.

Second, the terms "psychological warfare" and "political warfare" (as the British prefer to call their activities in this field) are misleading if they designate exclusively propaganda to enemy countries in times of war. Wars are waged against enemies in order to defeat them; yet during a war, psychological warfare comprises not only ancillary activities to the same end by certain non-lethal means but also actions which attempt to reach and make friends in the enemy camp.

For yet a third reason, the term psychological warfare is easily misunderstood. When it is used as a synonym for combat propaganda and related

activities in wartime, it seems to be implied that other forms of warfare
have no psychological effects, but only physical consequences, and are con-
ducted without regard for the mind of the enemy and the moral forces at his
command. In this context, then, psychological warfare emerges as a specialized
activity which injects into the "unpsychological" wars of the machine age the
recollection and rediscovery of man as the agent of aggression, the object of
suffering, the human element in bureaucratized strategy and industrialized
battles.[1]

The ambiguities of meaning from which the term psychological warfare
suffers stem from the lack of a more basic agreement on the nature of war.
It is inadvisable as well as tedious to begin this reconsideration of psycho-
logical warfare with a proposal of new definitions. The following discussion
will cover activities which the reader should feel free to include or exclude
from the field of psychological warfare as he delimits it. Fortunately it will
be possible to engage in this inquiry without using the word "psychological"
at all.

---

[1] I once was asked by an officer, "Does psychological warfare include
warfare psychologically waged?"

II.

Military writers are in the habit of distinguishing between the ability and the will to fight. An enemy can be defeated by destroying his capability of resistance, but failing this he will also succumb when his will to fight is broken. These two elements of war are not independent of one **another.** The will to fight is likely to be stronger if the ability to fight, compared with that of the enemy, promises a chance of success. Capability counts for nothing, however, if resolution to use it is wanting, and within certain limits strong will can offset the disadvantage of inferior capability, particularly when the opponent's resolution and perseverance do not match his superiority of force.

Incapacitation of the enemy by destruction, conquest of territory, capture or denial of men and material, blockade, etc., and incapacitation by demoralizing the enemy are two roads to victory. To assume that only destruction wins wars is tantamount to denying the intellectual and moral elements in war. It is obvious that demoralization, i.e. breaking the will to resist, may in turn be achieved by physical destruction, but statesmen and generals throughout the ages have used also less crude and more ingenious means to win wars. The amount and kind of destruction necessary for victory varies not only with the state of technology but also with the political conduct of the war.

The distinction between capability and will can be profitably applied to the analysis of international relations in times of peace, since in peace as well as in war the status of nations depends upon their ability and their will to change or maintain the prevailing distribution of power. Organized violence by means of military power is not brought to bear upon other nations in times of peace. For the citizen life is safer and more comfortable than

it is in wartime. His risk of suffering violent death is low and so are, relatively speaking, his deprivations. The potential use of organized violence, however, bears on the policies which are pursued in peacetime. The same holds true of scientific and technological developments which affect the protective and striking power of arms; of threats, warnings, denunciations of their possible use; of demonstrations that they exist and are efficient; of re-organizations and re-dispositions of the available forces; of partial mobilizations, etc. Nor are the other instruments of international policy invariably and exclusively reserved for either wartime or peacetime use: diplomacy, espionage, counter-intelligence, economic measures, organizational activities ("fifth columns"), propaganda—all these means are used in the pursuit of international policy in peace as well as in war. The erroneous opinion that the employment of any of these instruments is confined to wartime breeds illusions about the nature of peace, impairs the pursuit of foreign policy goals in peacetime and may render wars, when they come, more ferocious. It is quite possible that the recent popularity of the term "cold war" indicates not only the precarious nature of the postwar relations among the great powers allied during part of World War II but also the unjustified demand that peacetime relations ought not to reflect a struggle for power.

There are, of course, secular trends in the use and function of the instruments of policy. Military force has been applied with fewer political and moral restrictions in the wars of the Twentieth Century than in the conflicts of the two preceding centuries. Correspondingly, the function of diplomacy in Eighteenth Century international affairs was more continuous, i.e. less subject to modification and disruption by war, than has been true in the Twentieth Century. The effort of all great nations during the last four decades in using propaganda as an instrument of foreign policy in peace as well as in wartime has been more formidable than the effort these nations made in this field

during the preceding four decades.

Regardless of secular trends in the use of foreign policy instruments and regardless of the different modes of their employment in war and peace, war is not a state of affairs in which military force replaces all other means of policy. Nor is the state of international affairs in periods of peace independent of the balance of national war potentials. The national ability to attain or defend positions of international power, which is put to a test in war, influences the state of peace. So does the will to resist or commit aggression. But it now is necessary to determine more closely what "will" means in this context.

III.

Unless we ascertain whose will we have in mind when speaking of "the
will to fight" we are in danger of committing an anthropomorphic fallacy:
clearly, not everybody in a nation at war is really fighting. Unless we
ascertain further, then, what is being done and "willed" by those who are
not fighting as the nation pursues a given course of action, we miss the
various aims of "the will" that matters: evidently, not only "the will to
fight" is necessary for victory. Finally, if we are satisfied with the
simple juxtaposition of "capability" and "will," we neglect the intellectual
functions in warfare and peacetime foreign affairs: there must be knowledge
and thought if a will is to use means for a purpose. The following discussion
will attempt to clarify these three issues.

If wars were still waged by armed forces alone and if their leaders
could count on blind obedience to command, the only will to fight that would
count would be that of the officers--a situation which was approximated in
the European wars of the Eighteenth Century prior to the French Revolution.
Soldiers then were disciplined, unhappy and more afraid of their own superiors
than of the enemy. Nor did they depend at that time on a continuous flow of
freshly-produced supplies to replenish and improve their arms and ammunitions
while the war lasted.

Today, war efforts can no longer be sustained from arsenals or loans with
which to buy foreign manpower and available weapons. The physical resources
of the country must be exploited and the human resources of the whole nation
be mobilized in order to insure survival in large-scale war. A large part of
the non-combatant population must be put to work in order to equip and re-equip,
arm and re-arm the fighting forces of the nation. The industrialization of
the economy has changed both the standard of living and the standard of dying.

The functional role of the non-combatants in the war effort is buttressed by widespread emotional participation and intellectual interest in the war, which rarely existed prior to the modern nationalistic, literate, age. Finally, civilians as well as the armed forces are exposed to the danger of violent death, since the modern means of destruction permit attacks on the enemy's sources of armament, the urban centers of his industrial war production.

The will to fight is essentially a will to work on the part of the civilians in a nation at war. Moreover, while both combatants and non-combatants must be ready to die and suffer deprivation (regardless of any attractions and profits war may offer to some of them), the latter do not need to have a will to kill; the former do. They are victims rather than executioners of violent death. These differences have an important bearing on any intelligent enemy effort to break the national will to resist and require differentiated warfare.

The large non-combatant part of the population comprises at least four general classes of persons, which are of importance to this analysis.

There are, first, those who hold political power, or the political elite for short. Assuming that they, rather than the rulers of the military hierarchy, determine the policy of the nation as a whole, their "will to fight" is of supreme importance indeed for the outbreak of war, and while war lasts, for its conduct and conclusion. Similarly, they are responsible in times of peace for the international policy which the nation "as a whole" pursues. But this elite cannot be said to have a will to fight (or not to fight) in the same sense in which such will is asserted in combat. It is more appropriate to speak of the elite's function to decide what is to be done by the nation. Here we are primarily concerned with elite decisions in the field of foreign policy; but the relative stability of the domestic regime bears upon the process in which these decisions are made and its outcome. The conduct of

foreign affairs requires, of course, elite decisions which affect the domestic conditions of life, so that the stability of the regime necessarily narrows or widens the scope of choices which confronts the decision-making elite. Instead of ascribing to the political elite a will to fight (or not to fight) we shall therefore speak of its ability to govern (at home)--taking it for granted that they have a will to do so if they can--and its deciding foreign policy.

Those who hold power govern by means of staffs and control personnel; this personnel will be considered here as part of the elite. The function of this auxiliary personnel is to render it possible for the elite to avoid foolish decisions[2] and to see to it that decisions, whether foolish or not, are acted upon, once they are made. Among other things, the elite relies on foreign intelligence about capabilities and intentions of other powers, domestic intelligence on the stability of the regime and the capabilities of the country, advice in estimating the consequences of alternative foreign and domestic policies, control and suppression of domestic opposition (however defined), and communication with other groups holding less power. Note that the disruption of any of these functions impairs the elite's ability to govern and to make sound decisions, possibly with repercussions on the political elite itself, and particularly in times of war, on the nation as a whole.

The second and largest part of the non-combatants will be considered here as a unit and be called the working population. Its function in modern war has been mentioned. It must have "the will to work." In addition, the working population is required to obey the laws of the country. To the extent that the political elite has authority, instead of merely exercising its rule

---

(2) Cf. Harold D. Lasswell's and Abraham Kaplan's proposition, "Upper elites tend to be skilled in the practices of inter-personal relations rather than of the area in which decisions are to be made." (Power and Society, Yale University Press, New Haven 1950, p. 203).

by means of sanctions, the working population may, therefore, be said to have also a <u>will to obey</u> (or not to obey) the law of the elite.

The relation between the political elite and the working population varies, of course, with the formal and informal political structure of the state. The bearing which this fact has on attempts to break the will to work and the will to obey will be discussed in du course.

The working population comprises people of different skills. Persons of high skill are scarcer than persons of low skill. The loss of experts to the community through death, abduction, desertion or disloyalty, therefore, has grave consequences since they cannot be replaced easily. The top group of such "irreplaceable" skilled specialists within the working population, including selected scientists, administrators, business men, inventors, intelligence experts, engineers, etc., form the civilian key personnel. Like the working population to which they belong, the civilian key personnel must be willing to work and obey. Any successful enemy effort to weaken their will to work and obey, which is especially directed at this part of the community, is likely to have especially high returns not only because substitutes for key personnel are difficult to find but also because malfunctioning members in this group affect the operations of many others. Inefficiency of a charwoman is a nuisance, that of a top administrator a calamity. Moreover, many persons in key positions possess knowledge of high intelligence value. If they become talkative or disloyal, their value to the enemy as a source of information may exceed the value of their elimination.[3]

(3) On the importance of secrecy among key scientific personnel <u>in peacetime</u>, see H. D. Smyth's <u>General Account of the Development of Methods of Using Atomic Energy for Military Purposes</u> (1945), chapt. III. The hypothesis of fission was announced and its experimental confirmation took place in January 1939. "At that time," reports Smyth, "American born nuclear physicists were so unaccustomed to the idea of using their science for military purposes that they hardly realized what needed to be done. Consequently the early efforts at restricting publication...were stimulated largely by a small group of foreign born physicists..."

The non-combatants include a number of dependents, whose age or state of health makes them worthless to the war effort. Their will does not matter. The graphic military term for describing such dependents under conditions of siege warfare will here be used: these non-combatants are useless mouths (bouches inutiles).[4] While useless, such mouths may cry and thus affect the feelings and actions of those who care for them. .

Corresponding to the distinction between political elite and working population, we shall speak of military elite and fighting population in the combatant sector of the nation. (There are no military useless mouths, unless one were to regard non-fatal casualties as such.)

It will be assumed that the military elite determines military strategy and tactics in accordance with foreign policy decided by the political elite.[5]

---

(4) For an early recognition of this social stratum see Byzantine Anonymous, Stratogikos, I, 4 ("The useless people who cannot do anything for the common good..."), II, 9 ("...neglected by nature and fate..."), and III, 13.

(5) In practice, the functions of determining political and military strategies are neither easily distinguished nor always clearly separated. During the Second World War the supreme authority in both spheres of power was in fact held by the same person in the United States, the United Kingdom, China, the Soviet Union and Germany. (The situation differed during the First World War notably in the United Kingdom and Germany.) Concerning the place occupied by "psychological warfare" in the decisions of the political and military elites in World War II, see for the United States: Wallace Carroll, Persuade Or Perish, Boston 1948; Ellis Zacharias, Secret Missions, New York 1946; Charles A. H. Thomson, Overseas Information Service of the United States Government, Washington, D. C., 1948, Part I; Daniel Lerner, Sykewar, New York 1949; for Great Britain: Bruce Lockhart, Comes the Reckoning, London 1947; for Germany: Derrick Sington and Arthur Weidenfeld, The Goebbels Experiment, London 1942 (American edition: New Haven 1943); Rudolf Semmler, Goebbels--The Man Next To Hitler, London 1947; The Goebbels Diaries, 1942-1943, ed. by Louis P. Lochner, New York 1948. - For the first world war, see Harold D. Lasswell, Propaganda Technique in the World War, New York 1927, and Hans Thimme, Weltkrieg ohne Waffen, Stuttgart, 1932.

Under this assumption, the military elite has a __will to obey__ the political elite or must expect sanctions in case of disobedience. In this respect the military elite does not differ in principle from the working and fighting populations. As the military elite holds power over the latter, however, it must have __ability to command__ (corresponding to the ability to govern of the political elite). Furthermore, since the military elite and its staffs plan and execute military operations, we shall speak of its __determination of military missions__ to attain policy goals. Finally, it shares with the fighting population the __will to fight__ (or not to fight), although it should be observed that a large part of this elite holds planning, administrative and other posts which in some ways resemble top positions in civilian life.

Strictly speaking, the __will to obey__ military superiors is of greater importance that the will to fight even in the fighting population, inasmuch as under modern conditions of warfare the majority of those "under arms" does not fight the enemy but supports combat troops which do.[6] This division of labor, or rather, of the broad combatant function, is reflected in the differential casualty rates of various services and branches in the armed forces. Thus, the Infantry in the U.S. Army, while constituting about 10 percent of the strength of the Army, accounted for 70 percent of all the battle casualties in World War II.[7] In planning combat propaganda this stratified distribution of risks, which is associated to a significant extent with differences in social recruitment and civilian background, merits close study but for present purposes the whole combatant part of the population will be held to possess a will to fight (or not to fight).[8]

---

(6) On January 5, 1951, Senator Taft asked in the Senate, "Is it necessary for this country to provide from sixty to seventy thousand men in uniform and half as many more civilians in order to put a division of 16,000 men in the field?" (__Congressional Record__, Vol. 97, p. 64).

(7) Samuel A. Stouffer, et al, __The American Soldier__, Vol. I, Princeton 1949 (Princeton University Press), p. 330.

(8) In times of peace, the will to fight should not be taken as a desire to break the peace.

There are of course rare and common skills in the fighting population as well as among non-combatants, and the existence of key military personnel, distinguished by high skill and highly specialized training, needs special attention. Tribute has often been paid to these experts, because their contributions to war efforts are great. The function of key combatant personnel in war seems to have increased with increasing industrialization of warfare. Illustrations abound: the German shock troops introduced at the end of the first World War after the collapse of linear infantry tactics, the fighter pilots who defended the British Isles in the battle of Britain in 1940, commandos, airborne contingents, etc. An extreme case has been related in Churchill's account of the Second World War. In march 1941 the British succeeded in sinking the German submarine U-47 commanded by "the redoubtable Prien" as well as U-99 and U-100 commanded by two other "tiptop" officers. "The elimination of these three able men," Churchill comments, "had a marked effect on the progress of the struggle."[9]

In summary, a glance at the broadest outline of the functional and political structure of the nation at war has led to a considerable refinement of the notion with which we started and which plays so important a role in psychological warfare. The general notion of "the will to fight" has been replaced by six factors. Consequently, there are six ways of weakening "the will to resist," namely interference with:

1. the deciding of foreign policy (by the political elite),

2. the determination of military missions (by the military elite),

3. the ability to govern (of the political elite),

4. the ability to command (of the military elite),

5. the will to obey (of the military elite, the working population and the fighting population),

6. the will to fight (of the military elite and the fighting population).

---

(9) Winston Churchill, The Grand Alliance, Boston 1950 (Houghton Mifflin Company), p. 127.

If the indispensable functions of the auxiliary personnel attached to the elites are borne in mind, it appears that hostile action against foreign political and military elites can be taken especially by interfering with:

    a. intelligence on foreign capability and intention,

    b. intelligence on domestic capabilities and obedience,

    c. estimates of the consequences of alternative policies,

    d. control of the working and fighting populations and of the military elite by the political elite,

    e. communication with these groups.

Finally, we have found that combatant and non-combatant key personnel is crucial for the functioning of society in peace and war and thus a rewarding target in the international struggle for power. This is due to the fact that key personnel is difficult to replace and often possesses information of high intelligence value.

IV.

The political influence which the mass of the population is constitutionally able to exert upon the elite, i.e., their recruitment and their decisions, determines in large part the structure of the political community. Account must be taken of this structure in the international struggle for power. When the political regime is despotic, the mass of the population has no chance to affect the recruitment of the elite, to fill vacant elite positions, and to pass public judgment on elite decisions. In modern despotism, i.e., in totalitarian regimes, the political elite disseminates its exoteric opinions to the masses of the population. Moreover, the population is tightly organized and thus controlled. All deviant political opinions are either esoteric or are in any case kept secret, because of terroristic measures against those who are alleged to lean toward heresy.

An understanding, however false, of domestic and international events of the past and the future is offered through an official "ideology"-- a phenomenon absent in older tyrannies. These ideologies also contain the political definitions of friend and foe, law and moral standards. The ideology invests reality with meaning, however simplified, and provides the masses of the population with permitted language. Ideologies are therefore a comfort in a world which appears incomprehensible and menacing without them. As the political elite blankets the area it controls with approved opinions fitting into the official ideology, [10] it offers security, however costly, to the minds of all as it stabilizes the regime.

In view of these considerations it is folly to expect that the dissemination of another ideology by foreign propagandists can convert the masses of a population living under despotic rule to become adherents to a new ideology or to shake off the shackles of ideology altogether.

(10) Alexander Inkeles, Public Opinion in the Soviet Union, Cambridge, 1950.

The political elite is on guard against the emergence of counter-elites, i.e., those aspirants to power who attempt to reach their goals against the will of the ruling elite. In despotic regimes counter-elites, like less consequential opposition, can operate only under-ground or abroad.

The subordinate military elite is regarded as a potential counter-elite by those who hold supreme power. It is, therefore, distrusted, infiltrated, controlled, and purged from time to time. In the Soviet Union so large a proportion of senior officers were liquidated before the outbreak of the second World War that the efficiency of Soviet military power was considered in the West to be seriously impaired.[11] Similarly, the National Socialist leaders fought more relentlessly against the German military elite than the resistance of its members to Hitler's regime seemed to warrant.[12]

Since in modern societies the mass of the population cannot overthrow, or influence the policies of, despotic regimes without armed domestic or foreign support and without organized leadership, the population at large is no rewarding target of conversion propaganda from abroad. Efforts to break its will to obey can succeed only under special conditions which propaganda cannot bring about. Any notion to the contrary may be called the democratic fallacy of democratic propagandists who disregard the differences in political structure between the regimes under which they and their audiences live.

Ideological propaganda to the mass of the population living in despotic regimes is sometimes advocated because of the cumulative effect it is alleged to have. As its effect increases over a period of time, it is presumed to

---

(11) Erich Wollenberg, _The Red Army_, London, 1938.

(12) During World War II of 36 Lt. Generals 21 were dismissed by Hitler, 2 were expelled from the Army, and 3 were executed after July 20, 1944. Of 800 officers of the General Staff, 150 are said to have lost their lives as opponents to the regime. See Walter Görlitz, _Der Deutsche Generalstab_, Frankfurt, 1950.

lead to explosive action. Evidence for this proposition is lacking.[13] Politically relevant mass action presupposes the destruction or disorganization of controls by means other than propaganda, especially military force or subversion. It also requires leadership by a counter-elite. The control apparatus at the disposal of the elite may crumble in consequence of disruption from without and within, but hardly on account of attempts at converting those who are controlled.

Similar considerations apply to combat propaganda directed at the fighting population. Without prejudice to the need for propaganda directed at the combatant population in time of peace and during a war in stalemate and defeat situations, there can be little doubt that the wartime conditions favoring success of such propaganda are military superiority, victory, pursuit, and stalemate. A propagandist speaking for the side that retreats, has lost a battle, or is militarily weak, must fight uphill. Propaganda in war is an auxiliary weapon. Auxiliary weapons cannot turn the wheel of fortune if the main weapons are blunt, scarce, or lost.

---

(13) But there is evidence for cumulative effects of propaganda on opinions and attitudes, particularly when propaganda is monopolistic. Cf. Joseph T. Flapper, The Effects of Mass Media, New York, 1949 (mimeographed by the Bureau of Applied Social Research of Columbia University). Cf. also the review article by Wilbur Schramm, "The Effects of Mass Communications," in Journalism Quarterly, December 1949.

V.

In the conduct of psychological warfare sight must never be lost of the fact that a change in attitudes and private opinions amounts to little if it fails to result in deviant, politically relevant behavior.[14]

Generally speaking deviant, politically relevant behavior comprises all action which weakens the ability of the elites to govern and command. In war, those who fight may cease fighting, fight their own authorities and resist the enemy inefficiently. Those who work or fight may give information to the enemy, cooperate with him by fighting on his side once they are taken prisoner or have deserted. Members of the working population may slow down in their work or commit sabotage, spread rumors, organize those who are disaffected, engage in illegal activities, etc.

Like mutiny in the armed forces, revolution at home or secession under the leadership of a counter-elite are the most dramatic instances of disorder, weakening the regime or incapacitating it to pursue its foreign policy.

The conditions of politically relevant actions taken by the working population and by those who fight differ significantly in one respect. The latter have, in favorable military circumstances, a chance, however small, to desert or surrender to the enemy if their will to fight is broken. By contrast, the working population has no such opportunities. There is no line its members can cross in order to get out of the war. Once an enemy soldier deserts or surrenders, he increases his chance of survival. If an enemy worker wants to disobey his authorities, he cannot avail himself of the protection of foreign powers; as a rule, not doing what his authorities expect and want him to do considerably decreases the margin of his safety and adds to his chance of violent death by enemy action the risk of losing his life through sanctions by the domestic police.

---

(14) Goebbels distinguished between "Stimmung" and "Haltung," the former being politically irrelevant internalized responses (attitudes), the latter representing externalized responses (behavior) which matter. As long as the authorities can prevent the transition from "Stimmung" to "Haltung," Goebbels was entirely right in deprecating concern about "Stimmung."

It is not certain that military personnel can desert more easily in times of peace than in wartime; its moves can be supervised and controlled more closely in garrisons. For example, while the defections of Soviet soldiers during World War II surpassed in magnitude those of any other belligerent nation, the Soviet armed forces stationed in occupied countries after the war live in so strictly enforced isolation from their foreign environment that desertions are rare.

Civilians can leave their country more easily in peace time, despite emigration and immigration laws which restrict such movements particularly from and to countries with despotic regimes. The only groups with ample opportunities to defect are diplomatic and other personnel, including individuals belonging to the civilian key personnel, whose business takes them abroad.

Some of the deviant, politically relevant actions do not require joint efforts but can be taken individually, others cannot possibly succeed without organization. The power interested in breaking or weakening the will to obey must give thought to the organizational requirements of the deviant behavior it tries to induce, and to the magnitude of the risks incurred by such behavior.

Finally, intelligence estimates must be made of the self-interests of enemy non-combatants and combatants in deviant behavior, since these interests may be compatible with the interests pursued by the rival foreign power itself. Such compatability signifies what may be called the chance of alliance in non-combat warfare, and it is a matter of elementary statesmanship to assess the political worth of its exploitation.

Not much need be said here about the measures the rival power can take to help meet the organizational requirements of deviant behavior in an enemy regime. These measures range from the formation of counter-elites abroad (governments-in-exile) to their clandestine or overt support if they operate in the enemy country; from giving material aid and organizational assistance to the opposition in the enemy camp (such as arms, communications, facilities,

etc.) to assigning liaison personnel[15] or leadership to them[16]; from advice to blue time to strategic coordination of joint, foreign and domestic, moves against the regime.

Intelligent non-combat warfare attempting to induce deviant actions in the enemy camp reduces the <u>risks</u> of such actions and shows awareness of the irreducible risks even in its propaganda. Since in war some of these risks can be curtailed by foreign military action, coordination of the use to which the various instruments of policy are put is of great importance if good will, i.e. the will to disobey, in the enemy camp is not to be lost. Apart from military damage to the control apparatus, there are three principal ways of reducing the risks of deviant behavior.

(1) Psychological warfare can be careful to encourage only such actions which in view of the prevailing conditions are feasible without decimating the "resistance" in the enemy camp. If this care is not taken, the directors of the psychological warfare effort will appear either stupid or callous and lose whatever influence they are able to wield abroad.

(2) By the same token, psychological warfare can warn "allies" in the enemy camp of perils which threaten them. For example, RIAS (Radio in the American Sector of Berlin) broadcasts to the Soviet zone of Germany the names of informers so that anti-communists can be on guard against them. Moreover, specific advice can be given on how to minimize or avoid the hazards of deviant behavior. To cite a case of dubious value, during the last war soldiers were occasionally informed by the enemy how to produce undetectable symptoms of diseases which would put them on the sick roll.

(3) Instead of attempting to induce deviant behavior in the enemy population at large--a practice predicated on the absurd assumption that

---

(15) E.g. Fitzroy MacLean's airdrop in wartime Yugoslavia to work for the British with Tito.
(16) E.g. Lenin's famous journey in a sealed German train to Russia in 1917.

whole populations are imbued with the spirit of heroism and self sacrifice--
psychological warfare can concentrate on selected groups whose self-interest,
predispositions and organization are conducive to deviation. Work with and
through existing cells of resistance and disaffected parts of the population
is likely to be more effective and boomerangs less easily than indiscriminate
agitation. Correspondingly, in foreign propaganda, attention must be paid
to the fact that talking the way one talks to friends, even though their
existence in the enemy camp may be unknown or doubtful, is preferable to a
verbal combat with the enemy at large, since such talk is bound to reinforce
the opinion of hostile foreign intentions which the enemy elite spreads as-
siduously in the area it controls. Foreign propaganda of this sort may
strengthen rather than weaken the will to obey among the large mass of those
who, in situations of stress, derive comfort and security from the support
they give to their leaders.

The **self-interests** of groups and individuals in the enemy population
which can be exploited for "alliances" through non-combat warfare comprise
a wide range of possibilities. Broadly speaking, there may be political in-
terests of ethnic minorities in secession or liberation, a case skillfully
utilized by the British against the Austro-Hungarian Empire in the first
World War; there may be interests in the removal of controls which are felt
to frustrate the aspirations of counter-elites and organized support of the
will to disobey, as was the case among the European resistance movements in
World War II during the period of German occupation; there may be dissatis-
faction with social injustice, etc. Important opportunities for political
warfare have arisen throughout history in wars of coalition, since combined
national self-interests always are a somewhat brittle foundation for the
pursuit of a common policy, particularly in successful offense. In World

War II, Goebbels exploited adroitly the mass murder at Katyn to intensify dis-
cord between Poland and the Soviet Union, and until the very end of the war,
Hitler and his lieutenants hoped for a split between the Western powers and
the Soviet Union. Similarly, the Japanese astutely exploited political dif-
ferences among the Filipinos when at the beginning of 1942 Tojo promised that
independence of the Philippines be established at an early date.

Apart from these and other kinds of deviant political self-interest,
which are of great value to judicious political warfare, there is elementary
self-interest in survival which non-combat warfare can utilize. This is es-
pecially true when the employment or the threat of physical weapons intensifies
the fear of violent death among the subjects of attack. As has been pointed
out, civilians cannot surrender when their courage wanes or their will to obey
is broken. They produce panic, become apathetic or die. Yet impelled by the
need for self-preservation they may also take to flight. Flight in response
to propaganda is obviously confined to war time operations when the subjects
of attack are warned that they may be killed unless they take precautionary
action in order to survive. Since non-combatants are not expected to have a
will to fight and still are in some measures less reconciled than are comba-
tants to the prospects of death through enemy action, they are perhaps more
susceptible to warning than soldiers.

Warnings of impending attack differ from ultimata. An ultimatum tries
to force one course of action upon the enemy by threatening severe reprisals
if another course of action is followed. By contrast, warnings to non-
combatants of attacks to come, which were often delivered during World War II,
offer escape from the horrors of action which the warning power has resolved
to take. Those who are thus warned are again treated as "allies" rather
than as enemies. The political interests of the foreign propagandist in
disabling the enemy elite to govern a well organized population are reconciled

with the interest of the warned population in its self-preservation.
Instruction or advice to the target population as to what it should do in
view of the warning is a more powerful non-combat warfare measure than mere
warning which leaves to the resourcefulness of the target population and its
government what kind of evasive action to take.

The latter type of pure warning may be illustrated from Admiral Halsey's
memoirs. In January, 1943, at Bougainville, the following type of message
was dropped in pidgin English on native villages.

> "A serious warning from the big white chief to all natives of Puka
> Passage, Buin, and Kieta:
> This is straight talk. You must listen.
> The village of Sorum has been disloyal, has taken orders from the
> Japs, and has helped the Japs.
> We have now bombed them.
> We have also bombed Piula, Pok Pok, Toberoi, and Saui when they
> helped the Japs.
> If any villages help the Japs, we will bomb them and destroy
> them altogether.
> We have many planes, many bombs, and many soldiers.
> We will not hesitate to carry out this work.
> Before long we will come with all the American Soldiers to dislodge
> the Japs and kill them all and punish all natives who helped them.
> That is all.
> You have been warned."[17]

It will have been noted that by having regard for organizational re-
quirements, risk and self interest, those engaged in non-combat warfare
play a role quite different from that which the conversion propagandist as-
sumes. The latter is like a missionary, possessed of a faith which he deems
superior to that of the heathen, but unlike the missionary he talks from a
safe distance. The former identify themselves with the persons whose hazardous
political conduct they try to guide; they talk or at least appear to talk to
allies and friends. To the extent that their careful consideration of what
is expedient from case to case is governed by a sense of responsibility, they
are less likely to be tempted by the ruinous gratifications which all tasks

---

(17) Halsey, W.F., Bryan J., "Admiral Halsey's Story," Whittlesey House, New
York, 1947, pp. 150-151.

of human manipulation offer. Political warfare requires many skills, but also
certain moral qualities. Its directors must be able to move against the cur-
rents of popular passion and with distaste for adventurous showmanship.

In addition, they must know the foreign policy objectives of their
country.

VI.

Decisions reflect varying degrees of foresight. Foreign policy decisions
are reactive, when they are taken in response to faits accomplis; in this case
other powers move according to their plans, and the reactive elite "muddles
through." Decisions taken according to a plan are not strictly speaking pre-
determined by that plan but issue rather from a re-examination of a given
plan in view of a new situation. In other words, all plans of action embody
estimates of future countermoves, and each new decision to respond to a
countermove enables the planners to re-examine the adequacy of their foresight
as well as to bring their plan up to date. Since the pursuit of a foreign policy
is affected not only by the ability to carry out intentions, but also by the
execution of the opponent's policy, the foresight becomes dimmer the farther
it penetrates the future. It would be irrational to predetermine in a political
plan the exact decisions to be taken in the more distant future, because the
intervening counter moves are matters of probability rather than fact and un-
foreseeable events are matters of chance. Good plans of action are therefore
based on the determination of attainable objectives, but since the estimates
of what is feasible change with time, allow for flexibility through a change
of moves to reach these objectives. They also reflect a preference for initial
moves which do not irrevocably commit the decision maker to subsequent moves
and restrict his freedom of revising subsequent moves in view of unforeseen
events. If planning ahead frees the political elite from the pressure of un-
considered countermoves, rational, i.e., flexible planning may be paradoxically
said to free it from the pressure of irrational, i.e., rigid plans. This ra-
tionality of planning is well illustrated by a phrase which Churchill re-
peatedly used in setting forth possible courses of action to be taken against
the Axis during World War II: after determining feasible objectives and

certain suitable moves to obtain them, he pointed out that the moves might
have to be modified "as events serve us."

Military elites engage in planning as a matter of course, and in modern
wars, at least, are able to state exactly how many days ahead of or behind
schedule a campaign has progressed. The dependence of modern warfare on the
time consuming processes of mobilization, training, developing and producing
new weapons as older models become obsolescent, on logistical requirements,
etc., renders such planning imperative and constitutes, in fact, a powerful
stimulus toward planning the economy of the nation as a whole. Planning in
the field of foreign policy is more difficult, chiefly because the control of
the future embraced by the plan is shared with opposing elites. The time over
which the considerations of political planners range, moreover, is longer than
the time range of military plans. Broadly speaking, it is a military short
range objective in war to complete successfully a phase in a battle; winning
a battle means reaching a medium range objective; and victory in a campaign
attains a military long range objective. For the political elite in war, the
victorious end of a military campaign is, as it were, tantamount to attaining
a political short range objective; the winning of the war is a matter of medium
range considerations, and the best utilization of the international distribution
of power at the conclusion of hostilities is a long range matter. Any consi-
deration to establish peace forever, i.e., to abolish foreign policy, may be
said to be politically out of range or utopian.

There are probably historical and national differences in the extent of
foresight which various political elites incorporate into their foreign policy
plans and decisions. Given the lack of research on this intriguing subject
all propositions concerning it must be hypothetical in nature.

1. Utopianism, including the belief that the international struggle
for power can in the long run be replaced by an harmony of interests, is

associated with a lack of articulateness in defining political objectives of any range.

2. Relative military weakness is associated either with attempts to extend the time range of planning or with "reactive" moves.

3. Political elites that have risen to power from a state of persecution (when they were counter-elites) are more likely to plan far ahead than elites without such history.

4. Unless the staff of democratically constituted elites is powerful and has a slower replacement rate than the top elite itself, decisions are "reactive," short range or utopian; by contrast decisions by elites recruited from a political class (e.g., an aristocracy) are governed by considerations of medium and long range objectives.

5. Preoccupation of the political top elite with administrative staff functions is indicative of "reactive" decisions in foreign policy; with domestic intelligence: of short range aims; with foreign intelligence: of medium range objectives; with history: of long range goals.

Propaganda reflects in any case the time range prevalent in the decisions of the political elite. If the policy is reactive, propaganda is likely to be an uninspired news service, because it lacks any relation to policy objectives. In that case news has no political focus and the propagandist cannot establish the "meaning" of the events, although facts often do not speak for themselves and if they do, not the same way to all people.

If the political thinking of the elite is utopian, the propaganda effort will be missionary; against recalcitrant opponents who refuse to become converted it will turn fanatical. Only when the foreign policy objectives of the political elite are both articulate and "within range" can foreign propaganda perform a useful function. It does so, broadly speaking, by deriving the political meaning of events from policy objectives in order to influence the expectations of future events.

For it is the expectations of the enemy population on which psychological warfare can exert its most profound influence by disseminating "news." What has happened or what has been done, especially by another power, heightens or lowers expectations and changes their content.

In an intelligent psychological warfare program propaganda does not attempt to convert the foreign population to another ideology by claiming its superiority. Rather, the propagandist tries to shape expectations by interpreting events as tokens of the future. In doing so he creates an image of intentions. Moving from ideology to the concrete and specific concerns of the people he talks to, he descends, to use a phrase of Karl Marx, from language to life.

The propagandist can sometimes predict what the enemy elite will do in its domestic policy and what the masses he addresses will have to suffer in consequence. Such propaganda presupposes not only good intelligence about the prospective moves of the enemy elite (e.g., curtailment of food rations), but also reliable estimates that increased deprivations will be resented rather than accepted with patience or austere fervor.

More important, however, are the expectations of the population concerning the plans of the power for whom the propagandist speaks. Theoretically, the propagandist gains access more easily to his own elite than to the secrets of the enemy elite. In practice, however, the effort of the propagandist in influencing expectations depends on the extent to which his own elite permits him to share some of its secrets.

The members of the political elite and its staff concerned with decisions on what is to be done rather than on what is to be said have a natural desire for secrecy, because premature disclosures may enable the enemy to parry prospective moves. Even in Nazi Germany, ruled by an elite that attached great importance to international propaganda, the coordination of propaganda and

policy was far from perfect. The propaganaist is a professional talker.
Who likes to confide secrets to professional talkers? The fallacy hiaden in
this question lies in the implication that the propaganaist will aivulge the
secrets he learns. As every diplomat knows, it is possible to hiae and be-
tray secrets by both silence and talk. By the same token, the propaganaist
may conceal by talking or reveal by silence[18] what he is supposea not to
disclose, but he cannot do either, unless he is informed about the secret.
It should be noted, however, that the usual differences in social backgrouna
and career of "policy makers" and propaganaists increase the secretiveness
of the former.

The propagandist aoes of cou se not neea to know all secrets of his
political elite. Yet, in order to influence expectations abroaa ana to be
effective in the timing ana direction of this effort, he must be able to de-
rive propaganda policy from the foreign policy decisions of the elite. Other-
wise he is thrown back to get his inspirations from news or iaeology. More
generally speaking, the existence of policy objectives--short, medium and long
range--is a prerequisite of political warfare. The communication of these ob-
jectives to the directors of propaganaa merely insures cooraination in the use
of policy instruments.

Who, precisely, in the opposing nation is the enemy? Is it the military
elite as much as the political elite? Who, in the enemy camp, are potential
or actual allies? Which groups shoula have more power, which less? Is it the
foreign policy of the other nation that is to be modifiea or also its social
institutions? Precisely which, if any, of the latter; ana in what way? Are

---

(18) For example, National Socialist propaganda directives (so-called
Sprachregelungen) prohobitea at a certain date auring the last
war any mention of heavy water in magazines. If previous references
to heavy water had been notea from time to time, the abrupt silence
about the matter woula have been a aisclosure.

revolution, secession, etc., permissible, required, or not permissible (since they cannot possibly be a matter of indifference)? If required, precisely what means are to be applied to produce the desired state of affairs: incitement, infiltration, support? If support, what kind? What is the time scale of operations, i.e. the relation of short term to medium term objectives? In war, what are the political long range objectives, if victory is a medium range aim? In peacetime, what are the elements of a desirable relationship between the powers concerned? It is answers to questions of this kind which furnish the basis of political warfare, as distinguished from the gossip of news, the preaching of ideology, the performance of tricks and the projection of the self.

· VII.

In this section we shall turn to political warfare against elites. According to the assumption made throughout this essay, these elites are hostile or have at least designs to maintain defensively or attain offensively positions of international power at the expense of other nations. Elite decisions to surrender, to disarm, to form an alliance, to yield or to compromise are goals of political warfare in the same sense in which mutiny in the fighting population, sabotage among the workers, the rise of strong counter-elites or the defection of key personnel may be such goals. Maintaining the assumption of "warfare" as the specific state of international affairs with which we are here concerned, the decisions of other elites, if taken without interference, are not only in the interest of the nations they govern but also disadvantageous to the power engaged in political warfare against them. Hence the special task of political warfare to influence enemy decisions in order to reduce the power gain which they are intended to bring about and to turn it possibly into a loss.

Decisions by the political elite concerning foreign policy and the determination of military missions by the subordinate military elite require cooperation among the elite members. It is also necessary that certain staff functions be performed and coordinated. Political warfare can therefore attack the cooperation among elite members or the performance of their staff functions.

Cooperation is dependent upon a modicum of mutual trust. In this respect despotic elites are more vulnerable than democratic elites. It has already been mentioned that the subordinate elite is easily suspected of treason and easily regarded as a potential counter-elite. A study of relations between the political and military leaders in Germany during the Hitler period is especially revealing in this respect.[19] During World War II it was not fully

_____

(19) Similarly rewarding is a study of military failures and misfortunes of German and Italian commanders during World War II compared with those of British and American generals.

appreciated how easily distrust can be created.[20] A systematic exploitation
of these predispositions of despotic political elite requires reliable intelli-
gence on frictions within the enemy elite and need not be confined to the use
of propaganda. It appears that subtler, less public means, such as studied
diplomatic indiscretions in neutral countries or the sacrifice of intelligence
for the purpose of compromising certain elite members in the eyes of others
are more suitable means.

Desertions of elite members are rare and difficult to induce. If they
occur, however, they provide great opportunities to political warfare. The
sensational defection of Rudolf Hess, Hitler's deputy, was not exploited by
the British, which characteristically aroused rather than allayed suspicion
of the British on Stalin's part.

There is also evidence from the last war, particularly in the Goebbels
Diaries, that propaganda directed at the masses may directly or indirectly
through the monitoring services reach the political elite, which is subject
to less censorship than the population at large, and thus have an unintended
effect. It would therefore appear possible to use this channel of communica-
tion with the elite for specified purposes rather than by default. The same
holds true of using mass communications for contacts with members of the mili-
tary elite. Virtually all memoirs of military leaders in the last war fre-
quently cite enemy propaganda statements, and there are a few instances in

---

(20) Liddell Hart quotes General Blumentitt, "Hitler knew that Field Marshal
von Rundstedt was much respected by the army and by the enemy. Allied
propaganda broadcasts often suggested that the views of the Field Marshal
and his staff differed from those of Hitler. It was notable, too, our
headquarters are never subjected to air attacks. Nor was the Field Mar-
shal ever threatened by the French resistance movement - presumably, be-
cause it was known that he had always been in favor of good treatment for
the French. All these things were brought to Hitler's notice, of course,
in reports from his own agents. While he treated the Field Marshal with
respect - more respect than he showed other soldiers - he kept him under
careful watch." See The German Generals Talk, New York 1948, pp. 260-261.

which action was influenced by them.[21]

More important, however, than these relatively minor weapons in the arsenal of non-combat warfare against enemy elites are the measures that can be taken to interfere with the performance of staff functions. The following remarks are confined to the subject of interference with foreign intelligence and with advice on the consequences of alternative decisions by means of deception.[22]

According to the saying which Plutarch ascribed to Lysander, "Where the lion's skin will not reach, you must patch it out with the fox's," deception has been used throughout history in order to confuse the enemy. All deception is aimed at creating erroneous estimates of enemy capabilities or intentions and thus at inducing counter-moves which are wrong but appear to be right to the enemy.

Like successful secrecy, successful deception produces surprise and helps putting the opponent off guard. Secrecy attempts to keep intelligence from the enemy whereas deception provides him with misinformation. If secrecy about the next planned move were complete, the enemy elite would still make the best possible estimate of this move and act in accordance with this estimate. Deception is superior to secrecy in that it attempts to <u>influence</u> the estimate; at the same time it aids in obscuring real intent by disclosing a fake intent. Since deception is a form of communication with the enemy elite which it expects to be withheld, the disclosures instrumental to deception must appear either unavoidable or as mishaps: in either case the disclosure may be mistaken by the enemy as the result of its own reconnaissance or intelligence activities.

---

(21) See for example the entry under 20 June 1944 in Lt. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton, <u>The Brereton Diaries</u>, (William Morrow Co.) New York 1946, p. 289, "Owing to the enormous enemy propaganda on damage done by V-Is, it was decided at commanders' meeting to stage a strong air attack on Berlin tomorrow to counteract it."

(22) Interference with the control and communication functions of the auxiliary elite personnel have been touched upon when measures to reduce the ability to govern and command were discussed.

Seemingly unintentional disclosures are studied indiscretions, planted misin-
formation, etc. Seemingly unavoidable disclosures result from staging a dummy
reality in the hope that enemy reconnaissance will spot and mistake it for an
indication of genuine capability or intent.

Many paradigmatic forms of deception occur in the animal world. Friedrich
Alverdes distinguishes between the following forms of animal deception.[23]

1. "Sympathese," i.e. sympathetic coloration and behavior in relation to
the environment in order to deceive for aggressive or protective purposes the
sense of sight. Since "Sympathese" covers behavior as well as coloration,
"playing possum" ("Thatanose") is included under this heading. So are forms
of protective coloration which give the impression that the body of the animal
"dissolves" into the environment, e.g., the stripes of the zebra, (called by
Alverdes "Somatolyse"). Finally there are forms of deception which create the
impression that the persecuted, fast moving and vividly colored animal suddenly
appears to change into one that is not moving and is protectively colored. Such
"Heteropsie" may also be directed at the sense of hearing, as in the case of
locusts whose whirring stops when they settle down.

2. Mimesis consisting in protective similarity with indifferent elements
in the environment. Alverdes distinguishes between "Allomimesis," i.e., imita-
tion of inanimate things, "Phytomimesis," i.e., imitation of plants or parts of
plants and "Zoomimesis," i.e., imitation of another species.

3. Mimicry. Alverdes uses "zoomimesis" to denote cases of deception pro-
ducing failure to detect where mimicry is deception producing avoidance by
adaption of unprotected animals to the appearance of others which are protected
by poison, smells, etc.

---

(23) Friedrich Alverdes, "Tauschung und 'Luge' in Tierreich," in Die Luge,
      ed. by Otto Lippmann and Paul Plaut, Leipzig, 1927, pp. 332-350.

4. "Phobese," i.e. means which defenseless animals use to ward off their enemies by terrifying colors or behavior.

5. "Alloktation," i.e. coloration or behavior which lures other animals into the vicinity of those which prey upon them.

It may be added that animals (especially birds) may simulate being wounded in their flight in order to divert the attention of the aggressor from their young. There are also cases in which animals actively use parts of their environment in order to mask themselves.

The obvious similarity between deception "techniques" in the animal world and those used in human warfare is evident, but should not be over-emphasized inasmuch as man can add to the deception of the senses the deception of the mind. There is then a premium on inventiveness in the field of human deception.

Military history abounds with attempts to mislead the enemy by deceiving his intelligence service through ruses.[24] Military deception is used to

---

(24) See General Waldemar Erfurth, Surprise and the introduction to this book by Stefan T. Possony, Harrisburg, 1943 (Military Service Publishing Company), from which the following illustration is taken. During the first World War the British misled the Turks at Gaza to believe that the main blow of Gen. Allenby's forces would fall at the left flank.

"A whole month was spent in sending 'misleading messages by wireless telegraphy in a code which the Turks, by various ruses, had been taught how to solve, without realizing the situation.' In addition, a British staff officer on patrol ride let himself be surprised by a Turkish guard. He feigned to be wounded and ostensibly lost his haversack with an especially prepared note-book, including money, love-letters and several purported orders and military documents. The haversack was picked up by the Turks. The next morning, a notice appeared in the paper that was issued to the Desert Mounted Corps, stating that a notebook had been lost by a staff officer on patrol and that the finder should return it at once to Allenby's headquarters. 'A small party was sent out to search the country for the pocketbook... An officer was stupid enough to wrap his luncheon in a copy of these orders, and to drop it near the enemy.'" These ruses were successful." (p. 10)

For a few illustrations from World War II, cf. Field Marshal The Viscount Montgomery of Alamein, El Alamein to the River Sangro, New York 1949, p. 31 ff., 57, 7°-60; Desmond Young, Rommel, London 1950, pp. 173-4; Sir Giffard Martel, An Outspoken Soldier, London 1949, p. 206; Brereton, op. cit., pp. 273-4; Anthony B. Martienssen, Hitler and His Admirals, New York 1949, p. 79, 101; George C. Kenney, General Kenney Reports, New York 1949, pp. 268, 281-2, 330, 374, 384, 501; Admiral Halsey, op. cit., pp. 197, 207-8; Field-Marshal Lord Wilson of Libya, Eight Years Overseas, London 1948, p. 40; Sir Frederick Morgan, Overture to Overlord, New York 1950; Sir Francis de Guingand, Operation Victory, New York 1947, pp. 108, 155-6.

See also Jasper Maskelyne, Magic-Top Secret, London (no date).

mislead enemy intelligence concerning place and time, strength and objectives
of offensive or defensive operations in order to induce the enemy either to
overlook the imperative need for making a decision or to reach faulty decisions
which increase his vulnerability. Major deception schemes to mask operations
that involve a large number of combatants are often accompanied by self-
deception, i.e., cover-schemes which conceal the purpose of preparing the
real operation from those who are supposed to execute it.

It is doubtful that propaganda can effectively contribute to military de-
ception, although some major efforts to that effect were made in World War II.
U.S. propaganda after the invasion of Normandy kept calling attention to the
possibility of additional landings elsewhere in France in order to tie down
German reserves. These verbal efforts would probably have been of little avail,
had it not been for the deception measures taken in Great Britain which strengthened
German expectations of further landings. As has been pointed out, the effective-
ness of communications with the intent to deceive is altogether dependent on the
credible appearance of a mishap and on supporting evidence provided by "dummy
reality." It is not sufficient to claim that a move is afoot if observable
deceiving preparations of this move are not actually made or if the preparations
that are observed clearly deny the claim.

This simple principle of military deception was disregarded by Goebbels
who thereby testified to both his ignorance of military matters and his ludicrous
over-estimation of the power of cunning. Twice he attempted to deceive enemy
intelligence about imminent German offensives. The first effort was directed
in June 1941 at creating the impression that England rather than the Soviet
Union was about to be invaded by German forces. The scheme involved self-
deception at a confidential conference when the department heads of the Propa-
ganda Ministry were told that operations planned in the East had been called
off. Then Goebbels himself described in an article published in the

Völkischer Beobachter the invasion of Crete as a rehearsal for a great airborne

operation and implied that an invasion of the British isles was imminent. On

secret orders from Goebbels the article was immediately withdrawn, but not un-

til foreign correspondents had cabled the contents of the article out of the

country. As soon as it was known through tapping telephone wires that the or-

der for confiscation had also been telephoned abroad, all foreign lines were

closed.[25] It is not known what happened to British and Soviet Russian in-

telligence estimates in consequence of this ruse, but it is safe to assume that

the massing of more than 200 divisions on the German-Russian border spoke louder

than Goebbels' propaganda and censorship measures.[26]

A similar ruse was tried by Goebbels in the spring of 1942 in order to

divert attention from the impending German summer offensive on the southern

front in the U.S.S.R.[27] It again involved an article by Goebbels and the

dispatch of a German journalist first on a trip to the Eastern front, which

was much publicized, and then to Lisbon where he was instructed to let it be

known in a state of feigned drunkenness that the Germans would attack on the

central front.

These cases illustrate the wasteful histrionics of zealous propagandists.

They do not prove the futility of efforts to mislead enemy intelligence by

appropriate means.

It is likely that deception of political elites is more easily accomplished

than that of military elites, because in efforts directed at political intel-

ligence relatively less attention need be paid to producing "dummy capabilities"

or to camouflaging them and more reliance can be placed on the effectiveness of

(25) Rudolf Semmler, op. cit., p. 39-42.
(26) I am indebted to Miss Jean Hungerford for an examination of the New York
     Times, the London Times, the Daily Mail and the News Chronicle from June 9
     to June 22, 1941, for possible public effects of Goebbels' article. The
     incident was duly reported but was completely overshadowed by reports of
     the massing of troops on the Russian frontier, the possibility of war be-
     tween Germany and the U.S.S.R., etc.
(27) See the Goebbels Diaries, op. cit., pp. 162-227.

producing false notions of _intent_. A given capability can be used for various purposes and the intent to use it in any definite way cannot be safely derived from it, but the margin of error in deriving intent from capability grows in proportion to the scope of the enterprise under review. Whether or not a field commander is preparing for attack in times of war may be safely derived from the observation of certain unmistakable preparations for battle. Evidence of preparations for war itself may be less conclusive, simply because the political elite may decide to confine the "use" of national capabilities to rendering threats of war more effective. Deception in this case would be successful if the intent of war were conveyed in order to heighten the impact of the threat.

Furthermore, there are many political actions, e.g., the conclusion of treaties, which do not require observable physical capabilities. In these cases, again, induced mistakes in assessing the intent of foreign political elites suffice for deception.

Finally, to the extent that political elites are concerned with longer range objectives, deception bearing on these objectives may succeed without arranging elaborate "dummy capabilities." An illustration may be taken from Hitler's military conferences. On January 27, 1945, Hitler said to General Jodl,[28]

> "I have ordered that a report be played into their hands to the effect that the Russians are organizing 200,000 of our men, led by German officers and completely infected with Communism, who will then be marched into Germany. I have demanded that this report be played into English hands. I told the Foreign Minister to do that. That will make them feel as if someone had stuck a needle into them."

In conclusion, it should be stressed, however, that the use of deception in attempts at influencing the expectations and intelligence of opposing political elites is not confined to actions perpetrated by ingenious specialists

---

(28) _Hitler Directs His War._ The Secret Records of his Daily Military Conferences, selected and annotated by Felix Gilbert, (Oxford University Press) New York, 1950, p. 118.

in trickery. The highest form of political deception consists rather in major political actions which lead the opposing elite to misjudge the political strategy it attempts to fathom. Like political warfare in general this kind of deception is no substitute for policy planning; it presupposes the determination of the objectives which deception can help attain, particularly by actions which mislead the opposing elite in assessing the nature of these objectives and their interrelation in time and space.